

MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN

THURSDAY, JUNE 23rd, 2005

Commissioners Present: Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Al Boro, Vice Chair, San Rafael City Council
Hal Brown, Marin Board of Supervisors
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur Town Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon City Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax City Council

Commissioner Absent: Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council
Jeanne Barr, Ross City Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, TAM Executive Director
Tho Do, Transportation Engineer
Art Brook, Senior Transportation Engineer
Jessica Woods, Recording Secretary

Chair Steve Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

1. Chair Reports

Chair Kinsey appreciated the tabs placed on the agenda packet and in working with staff they developed their first ever Consent Calendar in order to move forward more expeditiously. Also, he thanked the Executive Committee for generously meeting in August when the rest of the authority would be vacationing in order to meet the goals of the strategic planning process that will be discussed later this evening. He pointed out that at the last meeting action was taken where TAM directed the Executive Committee to consider an allocation of some of the TE funding for bicycle education projects. At the meeting, staff indicated that TE Program is a very administratively intense program, so all parties, including representatives from Marin County Bicycle Coalitions, understood and agreed that this is the wrong funding source. Staff is looking for other funding sources for bicycle education. He announced that there will be a special meeting of TAM on July 7th in regard to hiring an Executive Director.

Commissioner Adams noted that she has a conflict that evening with the Oversight JPA Committee. She noted that if they finish early she would attend the special meeting. Chair Kinsey recommended scheduling the single item agenda meeting at 8:00 p.m. in order to allow more participation. The Commission and staff agreed.

Chair Kinsey announced at 7:46 p.m. that the Commission would take Agenda Item 13. out of order and have a closed session at this time.

CLOSED SESSION

13. Instructions to labor negotiator (Kris Kristensen of CPS Executive Search) regarding negotiations of salaries and compensation for Executive Director pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6.

RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

The Commission reconvened at 8:02 p.m.

14. Announcements from Closed Session

Chair Kinsey announced that labor negotiator Kris Kristensen of CPS Executive Search would be replaced by Vice Chair Boro and himself. They were given a salary range to work with, which would be discussed at the July 7th special meeting.

2. Commissioner Matters not on the Agenda

Commissioner Eklund noted that last night at Marin County Council of Mayors and Council Members (MCCMC) Commissioner Adams raised the issue of the Countywide Planning Agency and she did not have an opportunity to speak there, but desired to have the issue agendized here. She added that her understanding was that the proposal was to have LAFCO play a greater role in countywide planning, of which she had concerns, especially since LAFCO did not have representatives from all of the cities of Marin.

Commissioner Adams explained that they need to discuss the value of talking about land use globally, sharing resources in regard to issues of legislation and looking at newer issues such as energy. The discussion was to go back to (MCCMC) and not wait two years before having a discussion, especially since ABAG would be revising Housing Element numbers and they may want to discuss at a countywide level. Also, LAFCO offered to help facilitate a workshop and she believed the first step would be to have a discussion in a workshop format.

Chair Kinsey noted that there is a JPA that identified a Countywide Planning Agency, and if there were issues that need attention from a larger body it could be agendized for the existing Countywide Planning Agency in the interim.

Commissioner McGlashan attended the meeting as well and believed it would be beneficial to have a discussion on countywide planning and sharing of best practices. He is convinced that TAM could not deal with that matter or desired to take it on. Also, he,

along with the Sierra Club and League of Women Voters concur that a real administrative home is needed for this issue. He noted that he along with Commissioner Adams raised the issue at LAFCO and had an early meeting to discuss it and LAFCO agreed to hold a workshop, but if not at TAM, then where? He recommended agendizing this matter in order to call the question in order to discuss.

Commissioner Belser believed countywide planning is extremely important, which TAM has not dealt with in a long time. However, she has been on this body when it served a dual purpose, where they would adjourn one session and move into another session, which worked very well. In her view, if that is going to be changed in some fashion from this body, then a formal discussion should occur with TAM.

Commissioner Fredericks agreed it is important, but her concern is that if they have the discussion and decided they cannot do it, then who is the body to make the decision of the options.

Vice Chair Boro pointed out that this group is a Congestion Management Agency (CMA) as well as a Planning Agency and the 11 cities and counties fund monies for planning activities as well as the CMA, so if there is a discussion to be had TAM should discuss the matter. If there is a case made that issues must be considered; they must understand what they are; what they would entail; and make sure funding is in place from the cities and County to cover. Then this group should agree that once a month or every other month have a second meeting to function as the Countywide Planning Agency.

Commissioner Lundstrom recommended defining what types of issues each Commissioner envisioned being discussed under the countywide planning umbrella. They must have a productive discussion because she desired to know the scope.

Commissioner Murray agreed to discuss the vision, purpose and role of the Countywide Planning Agency. She believed it should be discussed at this level because they are trying to integrate land use and transportation. Also, they must be clear what they are trying to accomplish and reaffirm the position of the Countywide Planning Agency.

Chair Kinsey requested that this matter would be agendized for the next meeting. In regard to scope of this countywide effort, they should discuss what are the issues they anticipate coming in the near term, because that is an important consideration in determining how much they can and should be doing in the next year to year and a half.

Commissioner McGlashan agreed to work with staff to itemize some of those proposed issues. The Commission and staff agreed.

3. Executive Director's Report

a. Tribal Bond for transportation

Craig Tackabery, Executive Director, provided TAM with the status of the Tribal Gaming bond in their packets.

b. Summary of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Deleted Project Backfills

Craig Tackabery, Executive Director, summarized the projects deleted for TAM's consideration. At some point the Commission should agree to review projects on their merits, rather than continue to backfill. Chair Kinsey recommended agendaizing that matter with the Executive Committee and then bringing back a recommendation to the full body.

c. TAM Short-Term Office Space

Craig Tackabery, Executive Director, found an office space in the Civic Center for approximately 6 to 8 months, which would be adequate time for the Executive Director to find permanent space.

Also, AB 1623 is an Assembly Bill TAM supported for a \$5.00 vehicle registration fee for congestion management and water quality. It passed the Assembly floor. This week it was forwarded to Senate Transportation and Housing Committee and passed, and now goes to Senate Appropriations and finally the Governor.

Staff further noted that Doanh Nguyen from Caltrans is unable to attend the meeting tonight, but would return with a Caltrans report next month. The staff recommendation on the consent calendar includes that change.

Executive Director Tackabery noted that a member of the public pointed out an error in Item F of the Consent Calendar. Under Resolved (b) there should be a comma after the word "*plan*." Also, staff provided a color copy of Item H.

4. **Commissioner Report**

a. Executive Committee

Chair Kinsey pointed out that the minutes of the Executive Committee are provided in their packet and thanked the Executive Committee for meeting frequently to keep the planning process alive and moving.

b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Groups

Commissioner Murray reported that the Advisory Group met and deployed the matrix criteria that was adopted. The matrix that worked very well in narrowing down 36 different alternatives to four preferred alternatives. Also, there was a unanimous agreement that these were the top four and should be further pursued in the EIR.

c. SMART

Vice Chair Boro reported that the Tuesday night meeting was located in Santa Rosa with five Board members in attendance, two from Marin and three from Sonoma County. They met in Santa Rosa to discuss Railroad Square and to hear from the community of Santa Rosa. They started with a presentation from their consultants that talked about the criteria used to judge projects as far as consideration to the agency to support its ridership and to receive fair return on its property. Also, they pointed out that they are working within the limits of the City of Santa Rosa and they would not force any land use change and desired to be consistent with the City's planning efforts. He added that there were over 200 people in the audience, with 51 providing public comment. He noted that the people of Santa Rosa were very supportive and thankful that the Board was present, and supportive of the Railroad Square project. The project is 5.5-acres in the heart of their historic district. Also, the people were very supportive of the SMART project itself, and there was large support for a food and wine center; significant support for housing; support for park activity and making it pedestrian friendly; and overall a good consensus for mixed-use. He further noted that the tenure and tone of the audience was outstanding and their concerns were legitimate.

Commissioner McGlashan pointed out that 26 people desired a food and wine center and economic vitality/commercial mixed-use; and 21 people desired affordable housing. He added that people desired more density, which is not heard often in Marin. He believed this will be an extraordinary project and it is very exciting.

Chair Kinsey noted that at the July meeting of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission they will be taking up the issue of their transit oriented development policy. The Commission is on the verge of doing something that has not been done anywhere in the country, which is to tie in the use of discretionary transportation dollars to transportation land use connections on transit expansion corridors. He then discussed the remaining policy issues as follows:

- How high to set that threshold of expectation for the corridor as it relates to housing?
- Whether to include a figure for jobs or not?
- There is a strong sense to have a component around of expectations for affordable housing, but to do it through an incentive rather than requirement.

Chair Kinsey announced that the Commission would be facing those issues next month, and if others wanted to continue to be involved in that discussion they could contact him.

Commissioner Breen noted that the City of Santa Rosa has applied for one of the MTC planning grants under this policy for the Railroad Square area. It is going to be a real learning experience for the entire SMART corridor.

Commissioner Eklund pointed out that the SMART EIR is delayed and probably not be issued until August.

5. Marin County Transit District Status Report on Short Range Transit Plan

Chair Kinsey explained that the MCTD has the responsibility for developing the Short Range Transit Plan that will identify 5 to 7 years of transit investments and then bring that plan to TAM by October of this year. Also, issues related to school bus transportation need to be resolved well in advance of the next school year. He felt it was important for this body, not to delve into the details because that is MCTD responsibility, but to understand how school route bus service is working in the County and the kinds of choices and performance criteria for making those choices that the MCTD will be going through. He further indicated that MCTD will meet next week to review and provide policy direction related to school route service with a public hearing 30 days later.

Amy Van Doren, Transit Manager, provided TAM with material outlining the schedule for the five public meetings on the Short Range Transit Plan.

Bonnie Nelson, consultant to MCTD, provided a PowerPoint presentation to TAM for their consideration, that included the following:

- What is a Short-Range Transit Plan?
- What Have We Done So Far...
 - Data Collection and Analysis
 - Financial Analysis
 - Peer System Analysis
 - Initial Performance Benchmarks
 - Outreach
- Financial Capacity
- System-wide Projections
- Why Does MCTD Still Have a Deficit?
 - Local System Service Hours
- Why Does MCTD Still Have a deficit?
 - Cost Per Service Hour For Local Bus Service in Marin
- Opportunity To Enhance Revenue
- Bottom Line – There is a **structural** financial problem that can only be solved by reducing hours or lowering hourly costs.
- Fixed Route Service
- What We've learned...
 - Route Performance
 - Who Rides
 - Riders Feedback
- Existing All-Day Local Routes
- Route Performance
- Existing Productivity
- A Tale of Two Routes
 - The Top Performer: Line 35
 - The Lowest Performer: Line 21
- Who Rides...

- Age
 - Language
 - Income
 - Alternative to Transit
- Desired Improvements
 - Improvements that Over 20% of Respondents Indicated Were a High Priority.
- Fixed Route Service Planning Principles
 - Ridership Routes
 - Coverage Routes
- Optimizing Coverage Service
 - Focus On Subsidy/Passenger, Demographic and Geographic Cover, not Just Ridership.
 - Small buses
- All Routes Can Meet Productivity Standards
 - Set Minimal Standards For Coverage Service.
 - Set Aggressive Standards For Ridership Service.
- School Service
- Recommended Standards For School Service
- Possible Alternative To Ride and Roll
- Why Consider School Services Early
- Paratransit
- Paratransit Riders Are Primarily 75 Years of Age
- 66% of Paratransit Riders Have \$25K Annual Income
- Most Whistlestop Trips are Medical Trips
- ADA Eligible Populations Will Grow Significantly
- Ability To Serve Non-Mandated Trips is Decreasing
- Paratransit Issues
- We Need Your Help...
 - Where Do You Need To go?
 - How Could Transit Work Better For You?
 - What Matters Most?
 - Travel Time
 - Stops Close To Your Home or Destination
 - Frequency
 - Time of Day

Commissioner Adams recommended reviewing the universe of people who are likely riders and what that number would be and then compare that to the capacity. Also, she asked is there is any percentage of Whistlestop riders who could take the regular bus. Consultant Nelson responded that they asked the following question to Whistlestop riders: *“If you were allowed to ride free on the regular Golden Gate buses, would you use it?”* 1.6% would stop riding Whistlestop and ride Golden Gate; 14 % would some times ride the bus; and almost 70% would not be able to ride the bus even if it were free.

Commissioner Murray believed realistic goals and targets should be developed in order to measure success.

Commissioner Lundstrom noted that Larkspur has four schools in one square mile and Larkspur will probably receive a fifth school. She hopes this plan would include private schools, because the area is very congested from the schools. Also, the School District made a proposal to shift several students to the middle school, which will bring more congestion to that one square mile, so she urged the consultant to include the private schools. Consultant Nelson agreed and noted that the private schools are included.

Commissioner Breen desired to know the cost, and asked the consultant if a survey is being conducted on costs nationwide because they cannot build a system unless they know the facts, especially with Measure A money being very limited. Consultant Nelson responded that they have collected Bay Area data and it will depend on how much is big bus service, small bus service and who can operate the small bus service, so it is all a consideration. Also, they have very strong direction from the MCTD Board to review ways to reduce the unit cost as one of the key ways to effect system expansion. Commissioner Breen believed GGT big buses are not senior citizen friendly. Consultant Nelson agreed, but challenged TAM to review other cities that have big buses that are friendly such as Portland.

Commissioner Belser commented on the last two statements under the Ride-n-Roll alternatives and believed it would require careful monitoring.

Commissioner Adams asked the consultant if partnerships could be established with medical facilities so people could ride to a transit stop and then be shuttled. Consultant Nelson responded that a shuttle must be supported by the entity. The system as designed has become a hub system and over 30% of the passengers on MCTD routes make transfers, but the transfers are relatively painless. Consultant Nelson believed location is the key. Commissioner Adams noted that around Kaiser there are three schools, so there is also school traffic in the area along with Northgate Shopping Center, so she asked that it be investigated. Consultant Nelson responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Brown emphasized the value in keeping the present school service. He added that the data provided argues for really keeping the bus routes that currently exist and continue to move forward.

Chair Kinsey reminded TAM that MCTD will have a special meeting next week to discuss the school route service issue.

Transit Manager Doren announced that a public hearing will be held in early August.

6. Consent Calendar

- a. Approve TAM Minutes of May 26, 2005
- b. Accept the FY 2004-05 Audit

- c. Authorize the Chair to execute Professional Services Contract with Parisi Associates to provide management and implementation of the Safe Routes to School Program for the amount not-to-exceed \$960,000.
- d. Adopt the Resolution approving the Initial Project Report (IRP), requesting \$200,000 in Regional Measure 2 monies to fund adoption of the final design phase, including project management for the Allocation for Cal Park Tunnel Rehabilitation and Pathway Improvement
- e. Authorize the Request for Proposal for Local Agency Bicycle Plan Updates with Transportation Development Act Funds
- f. Adopt the Resolution Electing to be Subject to the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act for Employee Health Benefits and to pursue a business agreement with CalPERS for health benefit recommendation
- g. Adopt Resolution for Adoption of the Agreement for California Public Employees' Deferred Compensation Plan
- h. Accept the Executive Committee recommendation Look and Feel for TAM Materials
- i. Accept the 101 Gap Closure HOV Status Report

Commissioner Adams recommended pulling Items a, d, and e for further discussion. TAM agreed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Belser moved and Commissioner Fredericks seconded, to approve the Consent Calendar items b, c, f through i.

The item was opened to public comment.

David Schonbrunn, representing, TRANSDEF, discussed using Measure A money on the Gap Closure and it seemed as if the initial concept of a \$25 million dollar hole has gone away and these are simply funds being plugged in whenever and wherever and asked staff if that is accurate. Executive Director Tackabery responded that the \$25 million was an estimate of what was needed to fill the hole at that time. The commitment in his view of Measure A was to get that project done by December 2008. They had an opportunity to receive \$21 million in federal funds and they needed \$10 million match. They used Measure A funds to keep the project moving, if not, the project would not be completed on schedule.

Mr. Schonbrunn desired a commitment that all the sources that are available for the Gap Closure project other than Measure A would be used first and that Measure A will be repaid.

Mr. Schonbrunn stated that during the Regional Transportation Plan process there was an evaluation of various projects, one project reviewed by MTC was the auxiliary lane in the Gap Closure project from Lincoln to Mission and that was rated low, the implication being this was a waste of money, so MTC did not recommend that project. His

understanding after talking to Caltrans is that there is still a plan to add an auxiliary lane into the Gap Closure project in Phase 4. He believed if that auxiliary lane were no longer part of the project specification that would greatly simplify the design of the bike path and it would also allow the correction of some very grievous errors done by the Bridge District when they handed over the railroad right-of-way to Caltrans without talking to a railroad engineer. He is concerned that this auxiliary lane is a complete waste of money and if that space were potentially used for a bike path and to straighten out the rail line that would make a much better project. Executive Director Tackabery responded that the auxiliary lane was always an element of the project and it is included in the completed environmental document. It is not part of the project being constructed, but it is being planned for at a future date.

Chair Kinsey noted that the Gap Closure Committee is working on the issues of the alignment of the rail and bicycle/pedestrian areas and the recognition that the auxiliary lane is a consideration of all of that is in the mix.

Mr. Schonbrunn pointed out that TAM has never expressed any interest in seeing an auxiliary lane at that location and in his view this proposal has come solely from staff and Caltrans. He felt there is no reason for it and it is hurting the other projects.

The motion carried unanimously by TAM.

Commissioner Fredericks excused herself from the TAM meeting at 9:16 p.m.

Kim Baenisch, Executive Director, Marin County Bicycle Coalition, clarified in Segment Four that “*the project*” refer to both the sound wall relocation and the bike path construction. Executive Director Tackabery responded that it is the intent and the details are being worked out. Ms. Baenisch asked staff how the timeline of this project would coordinate with the HOV Gap Closure project. Executive Director Tackabery responded that it is proposed to be one construction contract.

The public testimony was closed.

Items c & e

Commissioner Adams noted that Items c & e did not mention the consideration for disability access along whichever routes are being discussed and believed some coordination with disability pathways should be considered. Executive Director Tackabery pointed out that it is included in Item c under Task 4.a. and staff will add to Item f.

Item c

Commissioner Eklund discussed the two-year contract for \$900,000 and asked staff how much has been spent in the past. Executive Director Tackabery responded that the County Contract was \$450,000 last year. Commissioner Eklund asked staff how much was authorized for this program in Measure A in total. Executive Director Tackabery responded about \$500,000 per year.

Item e

Commissioner Eklund discussed page 3 of 7 in regard to stakeholder groups for bicycle plans and she believed it is really important to include Safe Routes to Schools Committees because their bicycle needs may be different than the bicycle advocates. Executive Director Tackabery responded that the intent was to let each City craft their own process, but staff would refine if needed to clarify.

Commissioner Eklund moved and Commissioner Belser seconded, to approve Items c and e of the Consent Calendar. The motion carried unanimously by TAM.

Item d

Commissioner Adams pointed out a few corrections to staff for their review as follows:

- Cover letter dated June 23rd at the bottom state, “if rail options begin” rather than “as.”
- Page 4 – there is an error on Project No. 11.3 and believed “*cultural affairs department*” should be removed.

Commissioner Adams discussed the Resolution in regard to allocation of money for the SMART alignment and expressed concern for moving forward with a project even before they have the vote to indicate that it would occur. She desired an explanation about the bike route and whether it is separate from the SMART issue. Vice Chair Boro responded that SMART indicated that if built it must be built to accommodate the train at the same time; otherwise they would have to close the bicycle route down after it is built in order to accommodate SMART. SMART is seeking their RM2 in the desire to construct the entire project concurrently.

Commissioner Eklund recommended redefining the term “*cash flow*.” Executive Director Tackabery agreed.

Commissioner Brown excused himself from the TAM meeting at 9:34 p.m.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Breen moved and Commissioner McGlashan seconded, to approve Item d of the Consent Calendar with the changes discussed.

Vice Chair Boro discussed the Cover letter dated June 23rd and recommended stating, “*as*” or “*when*” rather than “*if*” as proposed by Commissioner Adams in order to be respectful of the intent of the property owner, which is to run a rail line, so “*when*” would be an appropriate word. Chair Kinsey pointed out that the motion on the recommendation, which is the attached update of the IPR and the Resolution approving the IPR and the cover letter discussed is really informational for TAM’s benefit and he did not believe it needed to be resolved.

The hearing was opened to public comment.

Karen Nygren, San Rafael resident, discussed No. 11.2 that talked about widening of Sir Francis Drake on the east side of Highway 101 and she hoped wording of this project description will be expanded to include the scope of what occurs on the west side of Sir Francis Drake as well.

The public testimony was closed.

The motion passed unanimously by TAM.

7. Public Hearing on Adoption of the FY 2005-06 Budget

- a. Memorandum of Understanding with County of Marin regarding Staffing
- b. Agreement with County of Marin for Legal Services
- c. Funding Agreement with County of Marin
- d. Resolution Authorizing a Request to Borrow Funds

Craig Tackabery, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that the TAM conduct a public hearing; review and approve the Fiscal Year 2004-05 proposed budget; approve the memorandum of Understanding with County of Marin regarding staffing; approve the agreement with the County of Marin for Legal Services; approve the Funding Agreement with the County of Marin; and approve Resolution No. 2005-10.

Vice Chair Boro discussed the first item in the budget regarding revenues for \$430,000, which stated, “TAM” and believed there should be a footnote because this money is to support the CMA. He added that TAM is supported by the ballot measure. Executive Director Tackabery responded that TAM has multiple responsibilities. Measure A provides some funding for administrative and project staff, some money is provided from MTC, and the \$430,000 money that helps that required local match. Staff pointed out that the revenues are blended and these funds help to support the CMA program specifically, because it is under funded. Vice Chair Boro recommended included a footnote in regard to the intent of use of monies. Chair Kinsey believed Attachment “B” could have a footnote that would identify the purpose of these funds to support the Congestion Management Agency functions. Executive Director Tackabery agreed.

Commissioner Eklund asked staff why the fund balance expected to be considerably higher than estimated. Nancy Whelan, Consultant, responded that they are projecting the fund balance and tried to be conservative, but believed there are enough revenues and less actual expenditures. She further pointed out that there would be a modified budget mid-year after the audit.

Commissioner Adams discussed expenditure for salaries and benefits in Attachment B and asked if these are expected to be for this interim period. Executive Director Tackabery responded that this is for the County contract and TAM staff is in the last block. Chair Kinsey noted that through the end of fiscal year 2005-06 they are contracting with the County and these are the rates, including overhead, and then a lump

sum for TAM staff. Also, for 2006-07 they would have created their own classifications for TAM.

The hearing was opened to public comment.

David Schonbrunn, representing TRANSDEF, expressed concern for a conflict in the debt financing section in regard to cash flow requirements being defined in the future. In his view the authority would end up with excessive debt service by borrowing early. Chair Kinsey responded that the budgets provides the maximum bonding authority of \$30 million, recognizing that as they develop the Strategic Plan and cash flow needs, they will be making financing decisions.

Mr. Schonbrunn discussed the funding agreement with County and in regard to the previous loans from the County to the Transit District, he asked if Measure A would be used to pay off those loans. Chair Kinsey responded that the Transit District has multiple sources of funding. Mr. Schonbrunn asked staff if the money allocated in the funding agreement included repayment of loans. Executive Director Tackabery responded that funding was based on a request from MCTD that indicated Measure A funds would be used for transit service. Chair Kinsey stated that MCTD's budget includes significant property tax, fare revenues, grants and Measure A, so the money to repay the loan has not been identified, but the loan repayments are included in MCTD budget for this fiscal year and TAM is not involved.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Vice Chair Boro moved and Commissioner Lundstrom seconded, to adopt the Fiscal Year 2004-05 budget, as amended, to approve the Memorandum of Understanding with County of Marin Regarding Staffing, approve the Agreement with the County for Marin for Legal Services, approve the Funding Agreement with the County of Marin and approve Resolution 2005-10. The motion carried unanimously by TAM.

8. **Committee Appointments**
 - a. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
 - b. Citizen Oversight Committee (OC)

Craig Tackabery, Executive Director, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM determine whether interviews will be necessary to appoint a member to the OC nominated by qualified Environmental Organizations; pending a decision on whether to conduct interviews to appoint a member to the OC nominated by qualified Environmental Organizations, make appointments, as outlined in the attached summary; appoint Daniel Keen to the TAC as an alternate member nominated by the Marin Managers Association; and continue to actively solicit nominations for the TAC and OC and fill any remaining vacancies on the TAC at future meeting when applications are received from nominating organizations.

Chair Kinsey moved and Commissioner McGlashan seconded, to appoint Don Wilhelm to represent the environmental organizations, and to notify the Grassroots Leadership Network that they should decide which of the two candidates from their organization should be the alternate. The motion carried unanimously by TAM.

Chair Kinsey asked for a motion.

Commissioner Eklund moved and Commissioner Lundstrom seconded, to appoint the new member to TAC and appoint all other members to the OC. The motion carried unanimously by TAM.

9. Strategic Plan Process

Craig Tackabery, Executive Director, provided TAM with a brief overview of the proposed Strategic Plan Development Schedule for their consideration.

10. Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Review Draft 2005 Capital Improvement Plan Project List

Peter Martin, representing, Wilbur Smith, summarized the staff report and recommended that TAM review and provide feedback on the draft 2005 CIP. Next month TAM would be provided a draft version of the CMP including a refined version of the CIP. By August they hoped to receive all comments on the CMP, so in September they would have a few minor refinements before it is sent to MTC. Also, the effort is on schedule, they completed all the data collection, and are in the analysis process and updating the document itself. Attached in the packet is a *“bubble diagram”* to explain the role of the CMP and CIP within the overall planning process. The vision plan is a long-range plan going out to 25 to 30 years; the congestion management program is a 7-year programmatic type of document that should move in the direction of the long-range vision and into the financially constrained Countywide Transportation Plan. A key piece of documentation that has not been fully nailed down is the financially constrained Countywide Transportation Plan that would provide a more specific direction for the CMP document itself to work towards.

Chair Kinsey asked if the list provided for CIP is the draft list of projects that would be undertaken during the 7-year period. Consultant Alison Kirk responded in the affirmative. She explained that this list is a draft and any feedback would be added. The list is financially constrained, but because it was done in that fashion in 2003 they would continue on in that manner and keep it financially constrained. Attachment “C” is a financially constrained list and it is a compilation of what has been collected in terms of projects that have now come to their attention. Chair Kinsey clarified that it is financially constrained relative to Measure A funds, all STIP funds and other Federal and State grant programs. Consultant Kirk responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Tremaine noted that he is surprised to see a suicide deterrent system and asked how it got placed on the list in regard to Item 23. Consultant Kirk responded that the suicide deterrent system came from MTC's list. Chair Kinsey noted that \$2 million is the estimated cost of the demonstration for the studies, not the actual installation, which was estimated to be a \$25 million project. He added that Item 23 is identifying the study.

Commissioner Eklund expressed concern for the suicide deterrent system being on TAM's list in regard to projects they desired funded. She felt there is a better use for \$2 million. Chair Kinsey explained that they do not have control over all of the funding sources and that is why the sponsors were identified. Consultant Martin pointed out that the CMP itself is essentially to review the regional transportation network for Marin County and to make sure that those regional facilities are maintained or improved. The CIP itself essentially provides an input into the MTC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), so that is the purpose of the CIP.

Commissioner Eklund recommended removing the suicide deterrent system from the list. Chair Kinsey believed TAM must better understand the role of the other project sponsors when they are not being generated by their own transportation authority.

Commissioner McGlashan asked if there is any advantage to their efforts long-term to include other bicycle or local road projects that do not exist on this list because there are several missing in Southern Marin. He believed they should make this an exhaustive inventory because this is the non-financially constrained list. Consultant Martin pointed out that the list before TAM is the financially constrained CIP. The entire document that the CIP falls under references all of the local and countywide bicycle plans and makes eligible all of those projects for Federal and State funding, but that did not mean that more specific projects could be line itemed and identified. Consultant Martin added that the intent was to bring this list to the Commission as early as possible in order to provide the list for review and consideration not only for TAM, but also members of the public.

Commissioner Adams has similar concerns, for example, regarding the Los Ranchitos Bike Lanes and that was not included on this list. Also, there is a major redevelopment around Lucas Valley Road and Miller Creek with housing and that project is not on the list. She added that Pt. San Pedro Road is in terrible disrepair and that is used as a major bicycle access way for those getting out to China Camp. Also, with all these Golden Gate Bridge District issues she asked how is that funded and would it funnel through the Congestion Management Agency. Also, she asked why their projects would be considered under TAM. Consultant Martin responded that if identified on the list it would ensure that it gets into the MTC TIP listing. Consultant Martin added that just because their project is on this list did not necessarily mean that money for that improvement would come from TAM sources.

Chair Kinsey stated that all of the identified bicycle and pedestrian improvements in all of the City and County plans are included by reference. Ideally, they would prioritize and identify the projects and in two years they will know what they expect to get completed, but for now TAM does not have the resources to develop that kind of prioritization.

Commissioner Breen recommended that they respect the process in place of working through the Public Work Directors on project list development rather than Commissioners throwing out projects.

Commissioner Eklund desired to make it clear that if there are some projects that TAM feels should be eligible for funding they must be on this list because it is a 7-year list. Consultant Martin pointed out that it is updated every 2 years.

Vice Chair Boro stated that there are other non Marin County entities on this list such as Caltrans, FHWA, and Golden Gate Bridge, but believed it would be helpful if staff came back and indicated that these agencies need a home to put these monies in order to flow it to MTC and they are not competing with TAM funds, but this is the Regional Agency requirement.

Commissioner McGlashan asked staff if they are sure that all projects are included in this list such as the Alto Tunnel. Chair Kinsey responded that it is included in Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Chair Kinsey recommended considering a column that would identify the funding sources in order to know what items TAM has discretion over. Executive Director Tackabery agreed.

11. Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

- Countywide Planning Issues

12. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda - None

Chair Kinsey adjourned the TAM meeting at 10:21 p.m.

MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN

THURSDAY, JULY 7TH, 2005

Commissioners Present: Steve Kinsey, Chair, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Al Boro, Vice Chair, San Rafael City Council
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council
Larry Chu, Alternate, Larkspur City Council
Paul Albritton, Alternate, Sausalito City Council

Commissioners Absent: Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Jeanne Barr, Ross Town Council
Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, TAM Executive Director
Art Brook, Senior Transportation Engineer
Bill Whitney, Senior Civil Engineer

Chair Steve Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 8:02 p.m.

1. Chair's Report

The agenda tonight contemplated award of an employment contract with Dianne Steinhauser. After the posting of the agenda it became apparent that TAM did not have employee benefits in place, therefore, this was not feasible. Local Government Services (LGS) is a consulting firm that can provide human resource services to TAM, and I request that an item be added to the agenda for a contract with LGS.

Commissioner Murray moved and Commissioner Albritton seconded, to add an urgency item to the agenda to Approve Agreement for Management and Administrative Services with Local Government Services Authority. The motion carried unanimously by TAM.

a. Urgency Agenda Item – Approve Agreement for Management and Administrative Services with Local Government Services Authority

Commissioner Swanson asked how long is this Agreement for. Patrick Faulkner, TAM attorney, stated one year with two optional one-year extensions. It is estimated TAM will be a PERS Retirement entity in 11 months, and then the contract can be terminated and the Executive Director can be hired directly. Commissioner Eklund desires detailed invoices including LGS administrative costs. Alternate Commissioner Chu stated TAM should take efforts to insure the consultant maintains independent contractor status.

Commissioner Murray moved and Commissioner Adams seconded, to approve the Agreement for Management and Administrative Services with Local Government Services Authority. The motion carried by a unanimous vote by TAM.

2. Commission Matters Not on the Agenda

None.

3. Adopt Executive Director Salary Range

Chair Kinsey reported the range recommended by the recruitment consultant, CPS as \$15,000 – \$19,000/month total, compensation.

Commissioner Eklund moved and Commissioner Fredericks seconded, to approve the Executive Director Salary Range. The motion carried by a unanimous vote by TAM.

4. Appointment of Executive Director

Removed from agenda.

5. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda

None.

Chair Kinsey adjourned the TAM meeting at 8:45 p.m.